

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:**  
**EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2013, COURTCALL IS THE SOLE METHOD**  
**FOR ARRANGING TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES IN**  
**LAW AND MOTION MATTERS.**  
**(see Local Rule 20.8.A.2.)**

These are the tentative rulings for civil law and motion matters set for Thursday, June 27, 2013, at 8:30 a.m. in the Placer County Superior Court. The tentative ruling will be the court's final ruling unless notice of appearance and request for oral argument are given to all parties and the court by 4:00 p.m. today, Wednesday, June 26, 2013. Notice of request for oral argument to the court must be made by calling (916) 408-6481. Requests for oral argument made by any other method will not be accepted. Prevailing parties are required to submit orders after hearing to the court within 10 court days of the scheduled hearing date, and after approval as to form by opposing counsel. Court reporters are not provided by the court. Parties may provide a court reporter at their own expense.

---

**EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE NOTED, THESE TENTATIVE RULINGS ARE ISSUED BY COMMISSIONER MICHAEL A. JACQUES AND IF ORAL ARGUMENT IS REQUESTED, ORAL ARGUMENT WILL BE HEARD IN DEPARTMENT 40, LOCATED AT 10820 JUSTICE CENTER DRIVE, ROSEVILLE, CALIFORNIA.**

---

**1. M-CV-0056598      Midland Funding LLC vs. Gibson, Brian**

Plaintiff's unopposed Motion to Compel Responses to Production of Documents is granted pursuant to CCP§2031.300. The defendant, Brian Gibson, shall serve verified responses and responsive documents to plaintiff's demands for production of documents to defendant, set one, without objections, on or before July 18, 2013.

**2. S-CV-0025680      Hawkins, Philip E., et al vs. Brown, Robert A., et al**

The Motion Confirming Issue/Evidentiary Sanctions is continued to July 18, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40 pursuant to the stipulation and order entered on June 25, 2013.

///

### **3. S-CV-0026786                      Reserves at the Galleria Owners Assoc. vs. Galleria Condo**

This tentative ruling is issued by the Honorable Charles D. Wachob. If oral argument is requested, such argument shall be held at 8:30 a.m. in Department 42:

Defendants' Reserves at Galleria, LP, Brenson Corporation, and James Brennan's (Developer Defendants) Motion for Good Faith Settlement

#### Preliminary Matters

As an initial matter, the court notes that defendant/cross-defendant American Underlayment Systems, Inc. (AUS) originally opposed the Developer Defendants' motion. However, AUS filed a notice withdrawing its opposition on May 24, 2013. With this withdrawal, there are no parties that oppose the current motion.

The court also notes that cross-defendants Custom Electrical Contractors, Inc. (CEC) and American Engineering & Asphalt, Inc. (AEA) filed a notice of disassociation as to the current motion. As to CEC and AEA, the motion is moot as these cross-defendants previously brought a motion for good faith settlement that was granted and the order was entered on April 15, 2013.

Finally, the court notes that the original notice of motion and amended notice of motion both refer to cross-defendant American Plumbing and Mechanical (APM) as a settling subcontractor. However, APM does not appear in the settlement agreement attached as Exhibit A to the Zinovyev declaration filed on April 30, 2013. Nor is cross-defendant APM addressed in the Zinovyev declaration filed on June 5, 2013. Since there is an inadequate showing as to APM, the motion is denied as to this cross-defendant.

#### Ruling on Request for Judicial Notice

CEC and AEA's request for judicial notice is granted pursuant to Evidence Code section 452.

#### Ruling on Motion

The Developer Defendants' motion is granted. The settlement agreement was entered into between the Developer Defendants', the settling subcontractors, and the plaintiff after negotiations facilitated by the Special Master. The Developer Defendants have agreed to pay their insurance policy limits in the amount of \$850,000.00 to the plaintiff. The twenty settling subcontractors have agreed to pay a total amount of \$441,600.00 to the plaintiff and \$5,900.00 to the Developer Defendants broken down as follows:

///

Cross-Defendant	Payment to Plaintiff	Payment to Developer Defendants
(1) ABCO Retaining Walls, Inc.	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 250.00
(2) Arcade Insulation	\$ 4,900.00	\$ 100.00
(3) AMPAM-LDI Mechanical	\$ 12,500.00	\$ waiver of costs
(4) Armstrong Wood Products, Inc.	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 250.00
(5) Collins Drywall, Inc.	\$ 9,500.00	\$ 500.00
(6) Foothill Fire Protection	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 250.00
(7) Geremia Pools	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 500.00
(8) JLS Environmental Services, Inc.	\$ 10,000.00	\$ waiver of costs
(9) Justis Enterprises dba Bill's Roofing	\$100,000.00	\$ waiver of costs
(10) Landscape Architecture	\$ 9,000.00	\$ waiver of costs
(11) Lee Ornamental Iron	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 500.00
(12) Sacramento A-1 Door	\$ 29,250.00	\$ 750.00
(13) Western Electronic Distributions, Inc.	\$ 750.00	\$ 250.00
(14) Valley Stairway, Inc.	\$ 73,500.00	\$1,500.00
(15) Sacramento Insulation	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 300.00
(16) D&D Westlake	\$ 27,500.00	\$ 750.00
(17) National Union Fire Insurance Co. Intervenor for AMPAM	\$ 30,000.00	\$ waiver of costs
(18) Salinas Valley Wax Paper Company	\$ 37,500.00	\$ waiver of costs
(19) Alliance Building Products, Inc.	\$ 82,500.00	\$ waiver of costs
(20) Atmos Corp dba Merzon Industries	\$ waiver of costs	\$ waiver of costs

The court has carefully considered the moving papers and supporting declarations and finds that the settlement, as to the developer defendants and the 20 settling subcontractors, is within the reasonable range of the settling torfeasors' proportionate share of liability for the plaintiff's injuries based upon the standards set forth in *Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward Clyde & Associates* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 488, and is in good faith within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 877.6.

If oral argument is requested, the requests for telephonic appearance are granted. A conference call will be arranged among the parties requesting a telephonic appearance.

#### **4. S-CV-0028990 McGhee, Erina vs. Miller, Brad Robert, et al**

Defendants Placer Sheriff's Department/Placer County's Demurrer to the First Amended Complaint and Defendant Telecare's Demurrer to the First Amended Complaint are continued, on the court's own motion, to July 11, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40.

**5. S-CV-0029426 Palomera, Jose vs. Perez, Hunter, et al**

Defendant's Motion to Quash and Strike Doe Amendment 26 and Demurrer to First Amended Complaint

Defendant's Motion to Quash and Strike is granted. (CCP§§418.10(a)(1), 436, 474; *A.N. v. County of Los Angeles* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 1.) The action as against the defendant Shawn Rawlins, Jr. is barred by the statute of limitations. (CCP§335.1.) If the action were not barred, there has been an insufficient showing that the delay in filing the doe amendment was reasonable. Furthermore, the delay is prejudicial to the defendant in light of the impending August 2013 trial date. For these reasons, the motion is granted and the Doe Amendment 26 as to defendant Shawn Rawlins, Jr. is stricken.

Defendant's Demurrer is dropped as moot in light of the court's ruling on the Motion to Quash and Strike.

Defendant's Motion to Quash and Strike Roe Amendment 3 and Demurrer to Complaint in Intervention

Defendant's Motion to Quash and Strike is granted. (CCP§§418.10(a), 436, 474; *A.N. v. County of Los Angeles* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 1.) The action as against the defendant Shawn Rawlins, Jr. is barred by the statute of limitations. (CCP§335.1.) If the action were not barred, there has been an insufficient showing that the delay in filing the doe amendment was reasonable. Furthermore, the delay is prejudicial to the defendant in light of the impending August 2013 trial date. For these reasons, the motion is granted and the Roe Amendment 3 as to defendant Shawn Rawlins, Jr. is stricken.

Defendant's Demurrer is dropped as moot in light of the court's ruling on the Motion to Quash and Strike.

In light of the court's rulings, defendant Shawn Rawlins, Jr.'s Motion to Continue Trial, currently set for July 11, 2013, is dropped from the calendar.

If oral argument is requested, the intervenor's request for telephonic appearance is granted. The court will contact counsel at the time the matter is called for hearing.

**6. S-CV-0030042 Thorson, Loran C. vs. Stimson, Kenneth L., et al**

The moving party is reminded that Local Rule 20.2.3 requires the information concerning the court's tentative ruling procedure be included in the notice of motion.

Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Deposition is denied. "Depositions of opposing counsel are presumptively improper, severely restricted, and require 'extremely' good cause-a high standard. [Citations.]" (*Carehouse Convalescent Hospital v. Superior Court* (2006) 143 Cal.App.4th 1558, 1562.) The court must consider a three-prong test when considering the possible deposition of opposing counsel: (1) Are there other practicable

means to obtain the information; (2) Is the information crucial to the preparation of the case; and (3) is the information subject to a privilege. (*Id.* at p. 1563.) Each prong is an independent hurdle to deposing opposing counsel and may be sufficient to defeat a motion to compel such a deposition. (*Ibid.*) In the instant case, the plaintiff has failed to sufficiently establish that there are no other practicable means available to the plaintiff to acquire the information. Nor has the plaintiff established that the information is crucial to the preparation of the case. In light of these deficiencies, the plaintiff has failed to meet this high burden and the motion is denied.

**7. S-CV-0030534            Brown, Jonathan vs. Guyan, Teresa L.**

Motion to be Relieved as Counsel

Attorney Edward C. Koon's unopposed Motion to be Relieved as Counsel for Crossroads is granted and he shall be relieved as counsel of record effective upon the filing of the proof of service of the signed order upon Crossroads.

Cross-Defendant's Motion to Dismissal Crossroad's First Amended Cross-Complaint

Cross-Defendant's unopposed motion is granted pursuant CCP§581(f)(2). Cross-Complainant's first amended cross-complaint is dismissed.

Cross-Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery and Sanctions

Cross-Defendant's unopposed motion is granted. Cross-Complainant Crossroads shall provide verified responses, without objections, on or before July 25, 2013. The matters encompassed in Plaintiff's Requests for Admissions, Set One are deemed admitted. Sanctions in the amount of \$224.50 are imposed on Crossroads pursuant to CCP§2033.280.

Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery and Sanctions

Defendant's unopposed motion is granted. Plaintiff Jonathan Brown shall provide verified responses and responsive documents, without objections, on or before July 25, 2013. The matters encompassed in Plaintiff's Requests for Admissions, Set One are deemed admitted. Sanctions in the amount of \$500.00 are imposed on Crossroads pursuant to CCP§2033.280.

Cross-Defendant's Demurrer to Cross-Complainant Brown's First Amended Cross-Complaint

A party may demur to a complaint where the pleading does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. (CCP§430.10(e).) A demurrer tests the legal sufficiency of the pleadings, not the truth of the plaintiff's allegations or accuracy of the described conduct. (*Bader v. Anderson* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 775, 787.) As such, the allegations in the pleadings are deemed to be true no matter how improbable the

allegations may seem. (*Del E. Webb Corp. v. Structural Materials Co.* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d 593, 604.)

The first cause of action for breach of contract, second cause of action for rescission, and third cause of action for declaratory relief are barred by the four-year statute of limitations. (CCP§337.) The fourth cause of action for declaratory relief fails to allege sufficient facts to support the action. Thus, the cross-defendant's demurrer is sustained in its entirety.

Failure to oppose a demurrer may be construed as having abandoned the claims. (*Herzberg v. County of Plumas* (2005) 133 Cal.App.4th 1, 20.) Since the cross-complainant has failed to oppose the demurrer and the first amended cross-complaint does not lend itself to an amendment that would cure the deficiencies, the demurrer is sustained without leave to amend.

**8. S-CV-0030548            McNutt, Lawrence, et al vs. Mackenroth, Noah D., et al**

This tentative ruling is issued by the Honorable Charles D. Wachob. If oral argument is requested, such argument shall be held at 8:30 a.m. in Department 42:

The appearance of the parties is required regarding the OSC re Preliminary Injunction.

**9. S-CV-0030724            Yarbrough, La Risa vs. Tavares, Bryan, et al**

Defendants' unopposed Motion to Impose Terminating Sanctions is granted pursuant to CCP§§2030.290(c), 2031.300(c) and the action is dismissed.

**10. S-CV-0030726            Gupta, Deepak vs. Dulay, Harpreet**

Attorney Craig Harris Collins' unopposed Motion to be Relieved as Counsel for Harpreet Dulay is granted and he shall be relieved as counsel of record effective upon the filing of the proof of service of the signed order upon Harpreet Dulay.

**11. S-CV-0031190            Zirelli, Louis J. vs. Quality Loan Services, Inc.**

Defendant's Demurrer is continued, on the court's own motion, to July 18, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 43 to be heard by the Honorable Michael W. Jones.

///

**12. S-CV-0031202                    L'Amoreaux, Roger, et al vs. Baldwin Contracting Co., et al**

Defendants' Demurrer to the First Amended Cross-Complaint is continued, on the court's own motion, to July 11, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40. The court file reflects that defendants' memorandum of points and authorities in support of the demurrer, filed on May 31, 2013, is incomplete and missing a substantial number of pages. Counsel for defendant shall file and serve a complete and properly executed copy of the aforementioned memorandum of points and authorities on or before June 28, 2013.

**13. S-CV-0031614                    Asset Acceptance, LLC vs. Valenzuela, Gonzalo**

The moving party is reminded that Local Rule 20.2.3 requires the information concerning the court's tentative ruling procedure be included in the notice of motion.

Plaintiff's second Motion to Vacate Judgment is continued to July 25, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40 for lack of service of the motion. Plaintiff shall re-notice the motion for the continued hearing and shall include the tentative ruling information pursuant to Local Rule 20.2.3 in the notice. The plaintiff shall file and serve the continued hearing date notice on or before July 5, 2013. Defendant shall be allowed to file any opposition on or before July 19, 2013. There shall be no reply.

**14. S-CV-0031698                    Mann, Urrutia & Nelson, CPA's vs. Strategic Tax Solutions**

Defendant's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Special Interrogatories, Set One

Defendant's request for judicial notice is granted as to Exhibits 1 and 3. The request is denied as to Exhibit 2. The court notes that defendant has withdrawn its request as to special interrogatories nos. 26 and 27. As to special interrogatories nos. 1, 3, and 4, the motion is denied. As to special interrogatory no. 20, the motion is granted. The plaintiff shall provide verified responses, without objections, to special interrogatory no. 20 on or before July 12, 2013. The defendant's request for sanctions is denied.

Defendant's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Form Interrogatories, Set One

Defendant's request for judicial notice is granted as to Exhibits 1 and 3. The request is denied as to Exhibit 2. Plaintiff's objections nos. 1 and 2 are overruled. The court notes that defendant has withdrawn its request as to form interrogatories nos. 4.1, 4.2, and 12.1. As to form interrogatories nos. 8.1 through 8.8, 15.1, 16.1, and 16.2, the motion is granted. The plaintiff shall provide verified responses, without objections, on or before July 12, 2013. Defendant is awarded \$550.00 in sanctions.

Cross-Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial

Defendants' request for judicial notice is granted as to Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 6. The request is denied as to Exhibits 4 and 5. Cross-defendant's motion is granted. The current trial dates are vacated. The 10-day jury trial is continued to December 16, 2013

in a department to be assigned. The CTC is continued to December 6, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 42. The MSC is continued to November 22, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. and the parties shall report to Master Calendar. All trial related deadlines shall coincide with the continued trial date.

**15. S-CV-0031788                      Banks, John E Jr. vs. The City of Rocklin Police Department**

Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery of Police Personnel Records is continued, on the court's own motion, to July 18, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 42 to be heard by the Honorable Charles D. Wachob.

**16. S-CV-0032157                      Bowles, Gene E. Jr., et al vs. Royal Gorge, LLC**

The parties' respective requests for judicial notice are granted. The court takes judicial notice of the existence and legally operative language of the subject documents, but not the truth of the matters stated therein. *Fontenot v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 256, 265. Defendant's Demurrer to the Second Amended Complaint is sustained with leave to amend.

As a preliminary matter, the demurrer to the second cause of action for adverse possession is overruled. Defendant cites numerous cases in support of its argument, none of which are cases in which the court considered the adequacy of pleading claims for adverse possession for purposes of ruling on a demurrer. Plaintiffs adequately plead facts constituting a claim of adverse possession pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 761.020(b) and 325(a). The issues raised by defendant are issues of evidentiary proof, rather than pleading.

The demurrer to each cause of action in the second amended complaint ("SAC") is sustained on the grounds that the SAC fails to join indispensable parties. Through the allegations of the SAC, plaintiffs seek to quiet title through adverse possession and Civil Code section 830 to the strip of land between their property and the low-water mark of the adjacent lakebed parcel. The court takes judicial notice of the CC&Rs for the Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2, which grant an irrevocable recreational license to lot purchasers to use "Lake Serena, Lake Dulzura and the beach areas adjacent to said lakes for recreational purposes." Plaintiffs assert in their opposition that no beach areas are designated or defined anywhere near or around plaintiffs' property, and that no beach-like areas exist. However, it is not clear from the allegations of the SAC, and from documents of which the court takes judicial notice, that the CC&Rs for Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2 refer only to specifically dedicated "Recreation Areas" as shown on the subdivision maps of which plaintiffs request judicial notice. Nor is it clear from the allegations of the SAC that the strip of land for which plaintiffs seek to quiet title may not be considered a "beach area" as provided for in the CC&Rs. Plaintiffs themselves assert that the definition of "beach areas" as stated in the CC&Rs is a question of fact. (Opp. at 7:4-7.)



In ruling on the demurrer, the court can only consider the face of the pleading under attack, or matters outside of the pleading that are judicially noticeable. *Donabedian v. Mercury Ins. Co.* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 968, 994. In this case, the court cannot find as a matter of law that the irrevocable license granted to lot purchasers in the Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2 subdivisions would not apply to the strip of land at issue in plaintiffs' action. Although the court must accept the allegations of the SAC as true, the allegations of the SAC do not preclude the possibility that the irrevocable licenses granted per the CC&Rs could potentially refer to the strip of land at issue in this action. As such, the SAC is subject to demurrer based on the failure to join indispensable parties, owners of lots in Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2. Code Civ. Proc. § 389.

Plaintiffs shall file and serve any amended complaint by no later than July 23, 2013.

**17. S-CV-0032158                      Gortner, Catherine Willis, et al vs. Royal Gorge, LLC**

The parties' respective requests for judicial notice are granted. The court takes judicial notice of the existence and legally operative language of the subject documents, but not the truth of the matters stated therein. *Fontenot v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 256, 265. Defendant's Demurrer to the Second Amended Complaint is sustained with leave to amend.

As a preliminary matter, the demurrer to the second cause of action for adverse possession is overruled. Defendant cites numerous cases in support of its argument, none of which are cases in which the court considered the adequacy of pleading claims for adverse possession for purposes of ruling on a demurrer. Plaintiff adequately pleads facts constituting a claim of adverse possession pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 761.020(b) and 325(a). The issues raised by defendant are issues of evidentiary proof, rather than pleading.

The demurrer to each cause of action in the second amended complaint ("SAC") is sustained on the grounds that the SAC fails to join indispensable parties. Through the allegations of the SAC, plaintiff seeks to quiet title through adverse possession and Civil Code section 830 to the strips of land between her property and the low-water mark of the adjacent lakebed parcel. The court takes judicial notice of the CC&Rs for the Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2, which grant an irrevocable recreational license to lot purchasers to use "Lake Serena, Lake Dulzura and the beach areas adjacent to said lakes for recreational purposes." Plaintiff asserts in her opposition that no beach areas are designated or defined anywhere near or around plaintiff's property, and that no beach-like areas exist. However, it is not clear from the allegations of the SAC, and from documents of which the court takes judicial notice, that the CC&Rs for Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2 refer only to specifically dedicated "Recreation Areas" as shown on the subdivision maps of which plaintiff requests judicial notice. Nor is it clear from the allegations of the SAC that the strips of land for which plaintiff seeks to quiet title may not be considered a "beach area" as provided for in the CC&Rs. Plaintiff herself asserts

that the definition of “beach areas” as stated in the CC&Rs is a question of fact. (Opp. at 7:4-7.)

In ruling on the demurrer, the court can only consider the face of the pleading under attack, or matters outside of the pleading that are judicially noticeable. *Donabedian v. Mercury Ins. Co.* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 968, 994. In this case, the court cannot find as a matter of law that the irrevocable license granted to lot purchasers in the Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2 subdivisions would not apply to the strips of land at issue in plaintiff’s action. Although the court must accept the allegations of the SAC as true, the allegations of the SAC do not preclude the possibility that the irrevocable licenses granted per the CC&Rs could potentially refer to the strips of land at issue in this action. As such, the SAC is subject to demurrer based on the failure to join indispensable parties, owners of lots in Serene Lakes Unit Nos. 1 and 2. Code Civ. Proc. § 389.

Plaintiff shall file and serve any amended complaint by no later than July 23, 2013.

**18. S-CV-0032502                      Flynn, Michael J., et al vs. Fields, Ty, et al**

Defendant Ty Field’s Demurrer to the Complaint is overruled. A party may demur to a complaint where the pleading does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. (CCP§430.10(e).) A demurrer tests the legal sufficiency of the pleadings, not the truth of the plaintiff’s allegations or accuracy of the described conduct. (*Bader v. Anderson* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 775, 787.) As such, the allegations in the pleadings are deemed to be true no matter how improbable the allegations may seem. (*Del E. Webb Corp. v. Structural Materials Co.* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d 593, 604.) The complaint, when read as a whole, is sufficient to sustain the five pled causes of action.

Defendant shall file and serve his answer or general denial on or before July 12, 2013.

If oral argument is requested, plaintiffs’ request for telephonic appearance is granted. The court will contact counsel at the time the matter is called for hearing.

**19. S-CV-0032588                      U.S. Bank, N.A. vs. Alizadeh, Abolghassem, et al**

The Motion to Vacate Judgment is dropped from the calendar since no moving papers were filed with the court.

**20. S-CV-0032730                      Coltharp, Michael, et al vs. Bank of America, N.A., et al**

The Demurrer is dropped from the calendar. A first amended complaint was filed on June 20, 2013.

**21. S-CV-0032764                      Hamlet, Linda vs. Justice, James Eugene, et al**

Defendants' Motion to Strike is granted without leave to amend. A party may file a motion to strike the whole pleading or a portion of a pleading. (CCP§435(b)(1).) A motion to strike may be granted to strike irrelevant, false, or improper matters in a pleading; or to strike a pleading not drawn in conformity with the laws of the state or an order of the court. (CCP§436(a), (b).) The grounds for a motion to strike must appear on the face of the pleading or from judicially noticeable matters. (CCP§437(a).) In this case, the factual allegations to support plaintiff's claim for punitive and exemplary damages are pled in a conclusory manner that is insufficient to establish fraud, malice, or oppression. Plaintiff has also failed to make a sufficient showing that she could cure this defect with an amendment. For these reasons, the motion is granted.

**22. S-CV-0032912                      Duerst, Ryan J. vs.. Superior Court of Calif. County of Placer**

The Demurrer to the Complaint is continued, on the court's own motion, to July 9, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 32 to be heard by the Honorable Angus Saint-Evens.

---

**These are the tentative rulings for civil law and motion matters set for Thursday, June 27, 2013, at 8:30 a.m. in the Placer County Superior Court. The tentative ruling will be the court's final ruling unless notice of appearance and request for oral argument are given to all parties and the court by 4:00 p.m. today, Wednesday, June 26, 2013. Notice of request for oral argument to the court must be made by calling (916) 408-6481. Requests for oral argument made by any other method will not be accepted. Prevailing parties are required to submit orders after hearing to the court within 10 court days of the scheduled hearing date, and after approval as to form by opposing counsel. Court reporters are not provided by the court. Parties may provide a court reporter at their own expense.**